



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375
7590 Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204				
EXAMINER BAUM, RONALD				
ART UNIT 2439		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 03/23/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/661,696	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRANDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RONALD BAUM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2439	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) RONALD BAUM.

(2) BRIAN STEED.

**Date of Interview:** 10 March 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 9:35am

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**    ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

  

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

n/a

**Claims discussed:**

all

**Prior art documents discussed:**

n/a

  

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

  

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  

/Edan Orgad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amending of claims 1,7,12,15-17,25,26,30-34,36,38-41,49 and 50, and previous/associated interview/discussions with the applicant's representative - Brian Steed - to address the issues involved with the claim elements rejected in the last office action (12/21/2009), has failed to ascertain patently distinct material to amend the claims (via examiner amendment). The applicant's invention, as claimed, still essentially comprises a security management system with associated acquisition, storage, analysis/scanning and results reconfiguration/assets management, as applied to at least , a factory/automation environment, utilizing at least standard processing network devices (e.g. PLC's, PC's , etc..). Discussed proposed potential amendments dealing with specific elements (i.e., the invention environment, protocols, network hardware elements, conformance issues, etc..) failed to patently distinguish the claims - insofar as overcoming a potential USC 103' obviousness rejection - at least, dealing with the obviousness of the proposed specific elements as an (obvious) intended use (e.g., PLC with I/O modules - a factory automation environment - as obvious intended use of PC's with standard peripherals on a network). Therefore, the examiner declines to reopen prosecution. Thus, any such claims submitted formally after final rejection would not be entered..